

III. Amendments to the Drawings

Replacement sheets 1, 2, 5 and 6 of the drawings, which include changes to Figures 1, 2a, 3a and 3b, are attached.

Specifically, Figure 1 was amended to replace reference character 94 with 96. This amendment was in response to an objection for having described in the Specification a magnitude signal 96 which is neither in Figures 1 or 3b. Accordingly, Applicants believe this amendment has cured the respective objection.

Figure 3a was amended by repositioning reference characters 376a and 380a, and Figure 3b was amended by repositioning reference characters 176a and 180a. These amendments were in response to an objection of inconsistency in the representation designated by "a" to "d" from left to right. Accordingly, Applicants believe this amendment has cured the respective objection.

Figures 3a and 3b were amended by respectively replacing 178 and 382d with 378a and 382a. Figure 2a was amended to replace 97 with 297. These amendments were in response to an objection that reference characters 178, 382d and 97, which appeared in the Drawings, were not discussed in the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants believe that this amendment has cured the respective objection.

Figures 3a and 3b were amended by removing reference characters 378, 382d, 178 and 182d. These amendments were in response to the objection for failing to discuss in the Specification reference characters 378, 382d, 178 and 182d. Accordingly, Applicants believe this amendment has cured the respective objection.

The drawings were also objected to because reference characters 294 and 296 have both been used to designate "magnitude signal" and "magnitude controller" in the Specification. Applicants believe this objection has been cured by the

amendments to the Specification. Specifically, Paragraph [0055] has been amended to replace "magnitude signal 294" with "magnitude signal 296."

IV. Remarks

Upon entry of this reply, claims 3-21 are pending in this application. Of these claims, claims 3-6 and 11-21 were rejected, and claims 7-10 were objected to. By this amendment, claims 3, 5-9, 11-12, 17 and 20 have been amended with claim 9 having been amended into independent form. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 102

Prior claims 1 and 2 were rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,435,417 issued to Holdgrewe (hereinafter "Holdgrewe '471"). Applicants have cancelled claims 1 and 2 in the present response and, therefore, this rejection is now moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a)

Claims 3-6, 11-14, 16, 17, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holdgrewe '471. Applicants have amended claim 9, which was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form, by including all of the limitations of base claim 1 and intervening claim 2. Accordingly, amended claim 9 and its dependent claims 3-6, 11-14, 16, 17, 19, and 20 are believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Claims 15, 18, and 21 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holdgrewe '471 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,729,989 issued to Sunaga (hereinafter "Sunaga '989"). Claims 15, 18, and 21 indirectly depend on amended claim 9. Accordingly, applicants believe these dependent claims are in a condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to each of examiners rejections and objections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe that all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowability, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

January 18, 2007
Date


Eric J. Sosenko (Reg. No. 34,440)

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s) of Drawings